

**UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT  
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI**

<b>IN RE:</b>	)	
	)	
<b>Jean Marie Scott,</b>	)	<b>Case No. 16-41545-can7</b>
<b>Debtor.</b>	)	
<hr/>	)	
	)	
<b>United States Trustee,</b>	)	
<b>Plaintiff,</b>	)	
	)	<b>Adv. No. 17-04048-can</b>
<b>v.</b>	)	
	)	
<b>Deighan Law, LLC., et al,</b>	)	
<b>Defendants.</b>	)	
<hr/>	)	

**ORDER NUNC PRO TUNC ON COURT'S ORAL RULING**

Pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. Proc. 60(a) as incorporated by Fed. R. Bankr. Proc. 9024, the court makes the following corrections to its oral ruling announced August 5, 2020:

1. In the Conclusions of Law section discussing Count I, subpart two, the U.S. Trustee's second alleged misrepresentation, in the paragraph that begins, "UpRight Law responds that the statement Mr. Fox made was not a misrepresentation, and in referencing the second argument, the court mistakenly said "Defendant" instead of "Debtor" in the sentence, such that the sentence should be read as follows: "Two, the United States Trustee failed to present evidence of the *Debtor's* reliance on the statement . . ."
2. In the Conclusions of Law section related to remedies under Count I, Section 526(c)(5), the court's reference to exhibits should be to "Exhibits 49 through 57 and 85 and 86," not "Exhibits 59 through 57 . . .," as the court mistakenly said.

3. In the Conclusions of Law section discussing Count II, with respect to judicial admissions, in the paragraph that begins, “And the court finds and concludes that UpRight Law violated Section 528(a)(1). . . ,” the court mistakenly said “ambiguous” instead of “unambiguous” such that the statement should be read as follows: “In fact, UpRight Law’s statement was so deliberate, clear and *unambiguous* . . . .”
4. In the Conclusions of Law section discussing Count V, the citation to the *Clark* case jump cite should be “161 F. Supp.3d at 759,” not “at 59.”

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: August 10, 2020

/s/ Cynthia A. Norton  
U.S. Bankruptcy Judge Cynthia A. Norton